arXiv:1603.07714v1 [math.PR] 24 Mar 2016

On tessellations of random maps and the t_g-recurrence

Guillaume Chapuy* [1,2]

[1]IRIF (ex-LIAFA), UMR CNRS 8243, *Université Paris-Diderot, France.*
[2]CRM, UMI CNRS 3457, *Université de Montréal, Canada.*

March 25, 2016

Abstract

The number of n-edge embedded graphs (rooted maps) on the g-torus is known to grow as $t_g n^{5(g-1)/2} 12^n$ when g is fixed and n tends to infinity. The constants t_g can be computed thanks to the non-linear "t_g-recurrence", strongly related to the KP hierarchy and the double scaling limit of the one-matrix model. The combinatorial meaning of this simple recurrence is still mysterious, and the purpose of this note is to point out an interpretation, via a connection with random (Brownian) maps on surfaces. Namely, we show that the t_g-recurrence is equivalent, via known combinatorial bijections, to the fact that $\mathbf{E}X_g^2 = \frac{1}{3}$ for any $g \geq 0$, where $X_g, 1 - X_g$ are the masses of the nearest-neighbour cells surrounding two randomly chosen points in a Brownian map of genus g. This raises the question (that we leave open) of giving an independent probabilistic or combinatorial derivation of this second moment, which would then lead to a concrete (combinatorial or probabilistic) interpretation of the t_g-recurrence. We also compute a similar moment in the case of three marked points, for which a similar phenomenon occurs.

In fact, we conjecture that for any $g \geq 0$ and any $k \geq 2$, the masses of the k nearest-neighbour cells induced by k uniform points in the genus g Brownian map have the same law as a uniform k-division of the unit interval. We leave this question open even for $(g, k) = (0, 2)$.

1 Introduction and results

In this note a *map* is a graph embedded without edge crossings on a closed oriented surface, in such a way that the connected components of the complement of the graph, called *faces*, are each homeomorphic to a disk. Loops and multiple edges are allowed, and maps are considered up to oriented homeomorphisms. A map is *rooted* if an edge is distinguished and oriented. The number $m_g(n)$ of rooted maps with n edges on the surface of genus g satisfies, for fixed $g \geq 0$ and $n \to \infty$:

$$m_g(n) \sim t_g n^{\frac{5(g-1)}{2}} 12^n, \text{ for } t_g > 0. \tag{1}$$

In genus 0, this result follows from the exact formula $m_0(n) = \frac{2 \cdot 3^n}{(n+2)(n+1)} \binom{2n}{n}$ due to Tutte [Tut63]. In higher genus, it was proved in [BC86] using generating functions. A direct combinatorial interpretation of Tutte's formula for maps of genus 0 was given by Cori and Vauquelin [CV81] and much

*Support from *Agence Nationale de la Recherche*, grant number ANR 12-JS02-001-01 "Cartaplus", and from the City of Paris, grant "Émergences Paris 2013, Combinatoire à Paris". Email: guillaume.chapuy@liafa.univ-paris-diderot.fr.

simplified by Schaeffer [Sch98, CS04]. A combinatorial interpretation of (1) was given in [CMS09] using the Marcus-Schaeffer bijection [MS01] and further developped in [Cha10].

None of the methods just mentioned enable to say much about the sequence of constants $(t_g)_{g\geq 0}$ that appear in (1), and indeed these references give explicit values only for very small values of g. There is however a remarkable recurrence formula to compute these numbers, that we call the *t_g-recurrence*. It is better expressed in terms of the numbers $\tau_g = 2^{5g-2}\Gamma\left(\frac{5g-1}{2}\right) t_g$ and is given by:

$$\tau_{g+1} = \frac{(5g+1)(5g-1)}{3}\tau_g + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{g_1=1}^{g} \tau_{g1}\tau_{g+1-g1}, \quad g \geq 0, \tag{2}$$

which enables to compute these numbers easily starting from $\tau_0 = -1$. This result was first stated in mathematical physics in relation with the *double scaling limit* of the one-matrix model, and obtained via a non-rigorous scaling of expressions involving orthogonal polynomials (we refer to [LZ04, p201] for historical references). A more algebraic approach is based on the fact that the partition function of maps on surfaces, with infinitely many parameters marking vertex degrees, is a tau-function of the KP hierarchy. Going from the KP hierarchy to the recurrence (2) (or to an equivalent Painlevé-I ODE for an associated generating function) relies on a trick of elimination of variables that can be performed in different ways and whose generality is, as far as we know, yet to be fully understood (for the case of triangulations see [KKN99, Appendix B.] or [GJ08, BGR08] and for general maps see[CC15]).

The main observation of this note is to relate the recurrence (2) to another side of the story, namely the study of random maps and their scaling limits. We refer to [LGM12] for an introduction to this topic. To state our main observation we first need a few more definitions. A *quadrangulation* is a map in which each face contains exactly four corners, *i.e.* is bordered by exactly four edge-sides. It is *bipartite* if its vertices can be colored in black and white in such a way that there is no monochromatic edge. For each $n, g \geq 0$, there is a classical bijection, due to Tutte, between rooted maps of genus g with n edges and rooted bipartite quadrangulations of genus g with n faces.

For $n, g \geq 0$, we let $\mathcal{Q}_n^{(g)}$ be the set of rooted bipartite quadrangulations of genus g with n faces (with the convention that there is a single quadrangulation with 0 face, which has genus 0, no edge, and two vertices). We let $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)} \in_u \mathcal{Q}_n^{(g)}$ be a bipartite quadrangulation of genus g with n faces chosen uniformly at random (the notation $\in_u$ to denote a uniform random element of a set will be used throughout this note). We equip the vertex set of $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}$ with the graph distance, noted $\mathbf{d}_n$, and with the uniform measure, noted μ_n. This makes $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)} \equiv (\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}, \mathbf{d}_n, \mu_n)$ into a compact measured metric space. The set of (isometry classes of) such spaces is equipped with the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov (GHP) topology as in [Mie09, Sec. 6]. A *Brownian map of genus g* is a random compact measured metric space $(\mathbf{q}_\infty, d_\infty, \mu_\infty)$ that is such that:

$$(\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}, \tfrac{1}{n^{1/4}}\mathbf{d}_n, \mu_n) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}, d_\infty, \mu_\infty),$$

in distribution along some subsequence for the GHP topology. The existence of Brownian maps of genus g was proved in [Mie09], and their unicity for each $g \geq 1$ has been announced by Bettinelli and Miermont [BM] (in genus 0 the unicity is an important result proved independently by Miermont [Mie13] and Le Gall [LG13]). However the unicity of the limit is not needed for our discussion since we will prove the convergence of all the observables we are interested in. Also note that some authors prefer to introduce an additional scaling factor $(8/9)^{1/4}$ to the distance, but this is irrelevant to our discussion so we prefer avoid it.

Theorem 1 (First observation, obtained by combinatorial means)**.** *For $g \geq 0$, let $(\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}, d_\infty, \mu_\infty)$ be a Brownian map of genus g. Let $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$ be chosen independently according to the probability measure μ_∞, and let $\mathbf{X}_g, 1-\mathbf{X}_g$ be the masses of the corresponding cells in the nearest neighbour tessellation of $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$ induced by $\mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_2$, that is to say:*

$$\mathbf{X}_g := \mu_\infty\Big(\big\{x \in \mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)},\ d_\infty(x,\mathbf{v}_1) < \mathbf{d}_\infty(x,\mathbf{v}_2)\big\}\Big).$$

Then the sequence of numbers $\tau_g = 2^{5g-2}\Gamma\left(\frac{5g-1}{2}\right) t_g$ satisfies:

$$\tau_{g+1} = 2(5g+1)(5g-1)\tau_g \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{X}_g(1-\mathbf{X}_g)] + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{g_1=1}^{g} \tau_{g1}\tau_{g+1-g1}, \quad g \geq 0.$$

From (2) we immediately deduce:

Theorem 2 (Second observation, by comparing Theorem 1 with the t_g-recurrence (2))**.** *For any $g \geq 0$, the random variable $\mathbf{X}_g$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_g(1-\mathbf{X}_g)] = \frac{1}{6},$$

or equivalently $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}_g^2 = \frac{1}{3}$.

The reader may find surprising that $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}_g^2$ does not depend on $g \geq 0$: indeed, although it is natural to expect that *local* statistics of Brownian maps do not depend on the genus, the nearest-neighbour tessellation depends *globally* of the metric space $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$, that *is* genus dependent. In fact, this unexpected property is the main reason why this note is written. It suggests that there exists a simple probabilistic or combinatorial interpretation of this mysterious fact, based on a symmetry of the Brownian map, but we have not been able to find it. We emphasize that, via Theorem 1, such an interpretation would provide a proof of the t_g-recurrence independent of orthogonal polynomials, matrix models or integrable hierarchies.

It is natural to ask if other moments of the variables $\mathbf{X}_g$ or related random variables are computable, and in which way they depend on the genus. Unfortunately we won't go very far in this direction. Let $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_k$ be $k \geq 2$ points in $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$ chosen independently at random according to the Lebesgue measure μ_∞. Let $(\mathbf{Y}_g^{(i:k)})_{1\leq i\leq k}$ be the masses of the k-nearest-neighbour cells induced by the $\mathbf{v}_i$'s, *i.e.* for $i \in [1..k]$ let

$$\mathbf{Y}_g^{(i:k)} := \mu_\infty\big\{x \in \mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)},\ \forall j \in [1..k]\setminus\{i\},\ d_\infty(x,\mathbf{v}_i) < d_\infty(x,\mathbf{v}_j)\big\}.$$

We note that $\mathbf{X}_g = \mathbf{Y}_g^{(1:2)}$, so we could have used a single notation, but we prefer to keep the lighter notation $\mathbf{X}_g$ for $\mathbf{Y}_g^{(1:2)}$ throughout this note. The following result is similar to, and as mysterious as Theorem 2:

Theorem 3 (A similar simple formula for the case of three points)**.** *For $g \geq 0$, the masses $\mathbf{Y}_g^{(1:3)}, \mathbf{Y}_g^{(2:3)}, \mathbf{Y}_g^{(3:3)}$ of the Voronoï cells induced by three independent Lebesgue distributed points in the Brownian map of genus g satisfy, for $g \geq 0$:*

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}_g^{(1:3)}\mathbf{Y}_g^{(2:3)}\mathbf{Y}_g^{(3:3)}] = \frac{1}{60}.$$

As we will see, the fact that this moment is computable reflects the existence of a combinatorial device known as the "trisection lemma" [Cha10]. The fact that it does not depend on the genus, and that it coincides[1] with the corresponding moment for a uniform three-division of the interval $[0,1]$, is as mysterious as for the previous result (or even more, since as we will see the computations leading to Theorem 3 are quite delicate and involve intermediate expressions that are complicated and magically become simpler at the last minute).

We won't prove anything on higher moments or other values of k since we lack the tools to study them. However, numerical simulations suggest that the first joint moments of the random variables $(\mathbf{Y}_g^{(i:k)})_{1\leq i\leq k}$, for small values of g and k, are close to what they are for a uniform partition of $[0,1]$ into k intervals. Of course one has to be prudent with simulations, given that the metric observables in random discrete maps of size n typically converge to their Brownian map analogue at speed $O(n^{-1/4})$, and that our numerical simulations are performed only for $n \approx 10^6$ to 10^7. However Theorems 1 and 3 support this conjecture, so we dare to state it explicitly:

Conjecture 4. *For $k \geq 2, g \geq 0$, let $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)} \equiv (\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}, d_\infty, \mu_\infty)$ be a genus g Brownian map and let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$ be chosen according to $\mu_\infty^{\otimes k}$. Then the random vector $(\mathbf{Y}_g^{(1:k)}, \mathbf{Y}_g^{(2:k)}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_g^{(k:k)})$ has the same law as the subdivision of the unit interval induced by $k-1$ independent uniform variables. In particular, for any $g \geq 0$, $\mathbf{X}_g = \mathbf{Y}_g^{(1:2)}$ is uniform on $[0,1]$.*

To conclude this introduction, we emphasize that our main observation relates the moment $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}_g^2$ to the g-th step of the t_g-recurrence. In particular, the fact that $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}_0^2 = 1/3$ for the *genus* 0 Brownian map is only "equivalent" to the computation of the genus 1 constant t_1, that can be performed by hand in several ways (and similarly, our proof of Theorem 3 for $g = 0$ relies only on the value of the constants t_1 and t_2). However, proving Conjecture 4 even for $(g,k) = (0,2)$ would be interesting in itself. Readers familiar with Miermont's bijection [Mie09] may try to approach this problem by exact counting of well-labelled 2-face maps (we have failed trying to do so). One could also hope that in the future purely probabilistic methods (for example using the QLE viewpoint on the Brownian map [MS15]) will enable to determine the full law of $\mathbf{X}_0$ or even the law of the vector $(\mathbf{Y}_0^{(i:k)})_{1\leq i\leq k}$ for each k. In an opposite direction, we recall that the t_g-recurrence is only a "shadow" of the fact that the generating functions of maps satisfy a set of infinitely many partial differential equations called the KP hierarchy. It is natural to expect that other joint moments of the variables $\mathbf{Y}_g^{(i:k)}$, apart from the two cases we have been able to track, are related to these equations. This may lead to a way, based on integrable hierarchies, of approaching Conjecture 4.

2 Proof of our main observation (Theorem 1)

2.1 Preliminaries

For $g \geq 0$ we let $Q_g(z)$ be the generating function of rooted bipartite quadrangulations of genus g by the number of faces, and we let $Q_g^\bullet(z)$ be the g.f. of the same objects where an additional vertex is pointed. We let $m_g(n) = [z^n]Q_g(z)$ and we use the same notation with $^\bullet$. In what follows the notation $a(n) \sim b(n)$ means (classically) that $a(n)/b(n) \to 1$ when n tends to infinity, while the

[1] if U_1, U_2 are two independent uniforms on $[0,1]$ and I_1, I_2, I_3 are the lengths of the three intervals they define, then $\mathbf{E}(I_1I_2I_3) = 2\int_0^1 dx \int_0^x dy \cdot y(y-x)(1-x-y) = \frac{1}{60}$. For a combinatorial calculation, notice that $\mathbf{E}(I_1I_2I_3)$ is the probability that five independent uniforms U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2, V_3 are ordered as $V_1 < U_1 \wedge U_2 < V_2 < U_1 \vee U_2 < V_3$, which is clearly equal to $\frac{2}{5!} = \frac{1}{60}$.



Figure 1: Illustration of the decomposition leading to Equation 5

notation $F(z) \sim G(z)$ means that both F and G are algebraic functions of radius of convergence $\frac{1}{12}$, both have a unique dominant singularity at $z = \frac{1}{12}$, and we have $F(z) = G(z)(1 + o(1))$ when $z \to \frac{1}{12}$ uniformly in a neighbourhood of $z = \frac{1}{12}$ slit along the line $[\frac{1}{12}, \infty)$.

From [BC86] (see also [CMS09] for purely combinatorial proofs) we have for fixed $g \geq 0$:

$$m_g(n) \sim t_g n^{\frac{5g-5}{2}} 12^n \quad , \quad m_g^\bullet(n) = (n+2-2g)m_g(n) \sim t_g n^{\frac{5g-3}{2}} 12^n$$

$$Q_g^\bullet(z) \sim \Gamma(\tfrac{5g-1}{2}) t_g (1-12z)^{\frac{1-5g}{2}} = 2^{2-5g} \tau_g (1-12z)^{\frac{1-5g}{2}}. \tag{3}$$

A *labelled map* of genus g is a rooted map M of genus g equipped with a fonction $\ell : V(M) \to \mathbb{Z}$ such that for any edge (u, v) of M one has $\ell(u) - \ell(v) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. We consider these objects up to global translation of the labels (we will often fix a translation class by fixing the label of a particular vertex, often the root, to 0). A *labelled one-face map (l.1.f.m.)* is a labelled map having only one face. We let $\mathcal{L}_n^{(g)}$ be the set of all (rooted) l.1.f.m. of genus g with n edges.

The Marcus-Schaeffer bijection ([MS01], see also [CMS09] for the version needed here) is an explicit bijection:

$$\mathcal{Q}_n^{(g)\bullet} \longrightarrow \{\uparrow, \downarrow\} \times \mathcal{L}_n^{(g)},$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_n^{(g)\bullet}$ is the set of rooted bipartite quadrangulations of genus g and n faces equipped with a pointed vertex. It follows that $Q_g^\bullet(z) = 2L_g(z)$ where $L_g(z)$ is the generating function of rooted l.1.f.m. of genus g by the number of edges. Moreover, in genus 0, rooted one-face maps are nothing but rooted plane trees, and a standard root-edge decomposition leads to the quadratic equation $L_0(z) = 1 + 3zL_0(z)^2$, from which we get the explicit formula:

$$1 - 6zL_0(z) = \sqrt{1-12z}. \tag{4}$$

2.2 The decomposition equation, Miermont's bijection, and proof of Theorem 1

We now come to the substance of this note, which is simply to try to write an equation for the generating function of l.1.f.m. by root-edge decomposition, and see what happens. We fix $g \geq 0$, and we consider a l.1.f.m. M of genus $g + 1$. If we remove the root edge of this map, two things can happen (see Figure 1):

(i) we disconnect the map into two l.1.f.m. M_1 and M_2 whose genera sum up to $g + 1$;

(ii) we do not disconnect the map; in this case we are left with a map M' of genus g with two faces. Each face of M' carries a distinguished corner, and the labels of these two corners differ by -1, 0, or 1.

Translating this operation into an equation for generating functions we obtain

$$L_{g+1}(z) = 3z \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2=g+1 \\ g_1,g_2\geq 0}} L_{g_1}(z)L_{g_2}(z) + zA_g(z) \tag{5}$$

where:

- in the first term the factor $3z$ takes into account the choice of the increment of label along the root-edge in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$;
- $A_g(z)$ is the generating function by the number of edges, of unrooted labelled two-face maps, with faces numbered F_1, F_2, such that the face F_i contains a marked corner c_i for $i = 1..2$, and that $|\ell(c_i) - \ell(c_2)| \leq 1$.

Objects counted by $A_g(z)$ can be related to quadrangulations thanks to Miermont's bijection [Mie09]. This bijection is a generalization of the Marcus-Schaeffer bijection where the l.1.f.m is replaced by a labelled map having an arbitrary number, say K, of faces. We will apply it for $K = 2$. In the following discussion, where we assume some familiarity with Miermont's bijection, we will show how to arrive informally at Lemma 5 below, and why this implies Theorem 1. Details of the proof of Lemma 5 are postponed to the next sections.

Let us consider an object counted by $[z^n]A_g(z)$. Let us fix the translation class of the labels by saying that the minimum label in face F_1 is zero, and let us call δ the minimum label in face F_2. Let $i_1 \geq 0$ and $i_2 \geq \delta$ be the labels of the two marked corners c_1 and c_2, respectively, and recall that $i_1 - i_2 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Applying Miermont's bijection [Mie09] to this object, we construct a bipartite quadrangulation Q of genus g by adding a new vertex s_1, s_2 inside each face F_1, F_2, and applying a certain closure operation. At the end of the construction, we obtain a quadrangulation such that $d(s_1, s_2) + \delta$ is even. Moreover, the two corners c_1 and c_2 of the original two-face map are naturally associated to two edges e_1 and e_2 of the quadrangulation, and the construction is such that if m_i is the endpoint of e_i closer from s_i in Q, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ one has:

$$d(s_1, m_1) = i_1 \quad , \quad d(s_2, m_2) = i_2 - \delta \quad , \quad d(s_2, m_1) \geq i_1 - \delta \quad , \quad d(s_1, m_2) \geq i_2.$$

These constraints can simply be rewritten as:

$$d(s_1, m_1) \leq d(s_1, m_2) - \epsilon \quad , \quad d(s_2, m_2) \leq d(s_2, m_1) - \epsilon, \tag{6}$$

where $\epsilon = i_2 - i_1$ is such that $|\epsilon| \leq 1$. Loosely speaking, the properties in (6) say that, *up to an error at most 1*, s_i is (weakly) closer to m_i than to m_{3-i} for $i = 1..2$. Unfortunately these constraints do not entirely characterize these objects (see next section) but they do, in some sense, asymptotically. Thinking heuristically for a moment, we can expect that the analogue in the continuum limit of these discrete configurations is a Brownian map with four marked points $(m_1^\infty, m_2^\infty, s_1^\infty, s_2^\infty)$ such that if we subdivide the space in two nearest-neighbour cells induced by m_1^∞ and m_2^∞, the point s_i^∞ belongs the nearest-neighbour cell induced by m_i^∞ for each $i = 1..2$. Up to technical details that we will carry out in the next section, this leads us quite naturally to the following conclusion:

Lemma 5. *The coefficient $[z^n]A_g(z)$ is such that, as n goes to ∞:*

$$\frac{[z^n]A_g(z)}{3/2 \cdot n^3 m_g(n)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_g(1 - \mathbf{X}_g)] \tag{7}$$

with the notation of Theorem 1.

Remark 1. The reader can understand heuristically the meaning of the denominator $3/2 \cdot n^3 m_g(n)$ as follows. The tuple (Q, s_1, s_2, e_1, e_2) is a quadrangulation with two vertices and two marked edges. We can use e_1 as the root-edge of Q, and orient it by deciding that its source is at even distance from s_1. We can choose the "error" ϵ freely in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ (since asymptotically we do not expect this error to play any role), and set $i_1 := d(s_1, m_1)$ and $\delta := i_1 + \epsilon - d(s_2, m_2)$. Since Miermont's bijection requires that $d(s_1, s_2) + \delta$ is even, we are left with a rooted quadrangulation with one marked edge e_2, and two marked vertices (s_1, s_2) subject to *two* parity constraints (that s_1 is at even distance from the root, and that $d(s_1, s_2)+\delta$ is even). Since a quadrangulation with n faces has $2n$ edges and $n+2-2g$ vertices, and since it is natural to expect each parity constraint to contribute an asymptotic factor $\frac{1}{2}$, the total number of "base configurations" we obtain is $\sim 3\times(2n)n^2/4 \cdot m_g(n)$, hence the denominator in (7).

We can now conclude the proof of Theorem 1. First, we can rewrite the decomposition equation (5) as:

$$(1 - 6zL_0(z))L_{g+1}(z) - 3z \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2=g+1,\\ g_1,g_2>0}} L_{g_1}(z)L_{g_2}(z) = zA_g(z), \tag{8}$$

which expresses the generating function $L_{g+1}(z)$ in terms of the lower genus functions $L_i(z)$ for $i = 1..g$, and of the "unknown" quantity $A_g(z)$. We recall that $Q_g^\bullet(z) = 2L_g(z)$ and (3), from which we observe that each term in the L.H.S. of (8) has a dominant singularity at $z = \frac{1}{12}$ with the same order of magnitude. More precisely, for the first term, using (4), we obtain $(1 - 6zL_0(z))L_{g+1}(z) \sim 2^{1-5(g+1)}\tau_{g+1}(1 - 12z)^{1-\frac{5}{2}(g+1)}$. For product terms we have $L_{g_1}(z)L_{g_2}(z) \sim 2^{2-5(g+1)}\tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2}(1 - 12z)^{1-\frac{5}{2}(g_1+g_2)}$. It follows, using standard transfer theorems for algebraic functions [FS09] that when n goes to infinity:

$$[z^{n-1}]A_g(z) \sim 12^n n^{\frac{5g+1}{2}} 2^{1-5(g+1)} \Gamma\left(\frac{5g+3}{2}\right)^{-1} \left(\tau_{g+1} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2=g+1\\ g_1,g_2>0}} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2}\right). \tag{9}$$

But from Lemma 5, we have another expansion of the "unknown" coefficient $[z^{n-1}]A_g(z)$, namely:

$$[z^{n-1}]A_g(z) = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{X}_g(1 - \mathbf{X}_g) \cdot 3/2 \cdot n^3 m_g(n-1) \sim \mathbb{E}\mathbf{X}_g(1 - \mathbf{X}_g) \cdot 3 \cdot 2^{1-5g}\Gamma(\tfrac{5g-1}{2})^{-1}\tau_g n^{\frac{5g+1}{2}} 12^{n-1}.$$

Theorem 1 follows by comparing the last two expansions of the "unknown" quantity $[z^{n-1}]A_g(z)$ (we recall that $\Gamma(\frac{5g+3}{2})/\Gamma(\frac{5g-1}{2}) = \frac{(5g+1)(5g-1)}{4}$).

2.3 Remaining proofs, I: general properties

Because we will need to pick both edges and vertices at random, we first need a lemma that compares both:

Lemma 6. *Given a quadrangulation Q of genus g with n faces, there exists a probability measure μ_n^E on edges of Q and a mapping $\phi : E(Q) \to V(Q)$ that associates to each edge of E a vertex at distance at most one of one of its endpoints, such that the distance in total variation between μ_n^E and the uniform measure on edges, and between $\phi \circ \mu_n^E$ and the uniform measure on vertices, are both $O(\frac{1}{n})$.*

Proof. Let L be the l.1.f.m associated to Q via the Marcus-Schaeffer bijection and let $v_0 \in V(L)$. The map L has $n+1-2g$ vertices, so it is possible to choose a set E'_L of $n-2g$ edges of L and an orientation of edges of E'_L such that each vertex of $V \setminus \{v_0\}$ has exactly one outgoing edge from E'_L (to see this, take a spanning tree of L and orient edges towards v_0). If $e \in E'_L$, we let $v(e)$ be its source, which is an element of $V \setminus \{v_0\}$. The edge e of E'_L is associated, via the Marcus-Schaeffer bijection, to a face $f(e)$ of the quadrangulation Q that is incident to the vertex $v(e)$. We let E'_Q be the subset of edges of Q that border a face of the form $f(e)$ for some $e \in E_L$ and that are oriented from white to black when going clockwise around $f(e)$ (in some fixed bicoloration of Q). If $\tilde{e} \in E'_Q$, corresponding to the face $f(e)$, we define $\phi(\tilde{e}) := v(e)$. Since $\tilde{e}$ and $\psi(\tilde{e})$ both border the face $f(e)$, they are at distance at most one from each other. Moreover, if we choose $\tilde{e}$ uniformly at random from E'_Q, then by construction $\psi(\tilde{e})$ is uniform in $V \setminus \{v_0\}$. Since E'_Q contains $2(n-2g)$ edges of Q (among $2n$) and $V \setminus \{v_0\}$ contains $n-2g$ vertices of Q (among $n+2-2g$), we are done. □

In the following discussion we will implicitly restrict ourselves to a subsequence along which we have the GHP distributional convergence:

$$(\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}, \tfrac{1}{n^{1/4}}\mathbf{d}_n, \mu_n) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}, d_\infty, \mu_\infty).$$

We will need the following direct consequence of [Cha10, Thm. 4]. We state separately a discrete and a continuous statement, although they are intimately related:

Lemma 7.
(i) Let $(\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}, d_\infty, \mu_\infty)$ be a Brownian map of genus g and let $(\mathbf{v}_1^\infty, \mathbf{v}_2^\infty, \mathbf{v}_3^\infty)$ chosen at random according to $\mu_\infty^{\otimes 3}$. Then almost surely we have $d_\infty(\mathbf{v}_1^\infty, \mathbf{v}_3^\infty) \neq d_\infty(\mathbf{v}_2^\infty, \mathbf{v}_3^\infty)$.

(ii) Fix $K \geq 0$, and pick three uniform random vertices $\mathbf{v}_1^n$, $\mathbf{v}_2^n$, $\mathbf{v}_3^n$ in $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}$. Then the probability that $|d(\mathbf{v}_1^n, \mathbf{v}_3^n) - d(\mathbf{v}_2^n, \mathbf{v}_3^n)| \leq K$ goes to zero when n goes to infinity.

Proof. It is proved in [Cha10] that if $\mathbf{v}_1 \in_u V(\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)})$, the random measure

$$\eta_n^{(g)} := \tfrac{1}{|V(\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)})|} \sum_{v \in V(\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)})} \delta_{d_n(v,\mathbf{v}_1)/n^{1/4}}$$

converges in distribution to a random measure η_g that, almost surely, has no atoms (this last fact following from the fact that it is true for the ISE measure, see e.g. [BMJ06], and from the relation between η_g and ISE given in [Cha10]). Now for $\alpha > 0$, let $p_{n,\alpha} := \mathbf{P}\big\{|d(\mathbf{v}_1^n, \mathbf{v}_3^n) - d(\mathbf{v}_2^n, \mathbf{v}_3^n)| \leq \alpha n^{1/4}\big\} = \mathbf{E}\langle (\eta_n^{(g)})^{\otimes 2} | h_\alpha \rangle$ where $h_\alpha(x,y) := \mathbf{1}_{|y-x| \leq \alpha}$ (here for a measure ν and a function h we note $\langle \nu | h \rangle := \int h(x) d\nu(x)$). Convergence in law implies that $\lim_n \mathbf{E}\langle (\eta_n^{(g)})^{\otimes 2} | f \rangle = \mathbf{E}\langle \eta_g^{\otimes 2} | f \rangle$ for any bounded and continuous function f, so choosing $f = f_\alpha$ continuous such that $h_\alpha \leq f_\alpha \leq h_{2\alpha}$ we get $\limsup_n p_\alpha^n \leq \mathbf{E}\langle (\eta_g)^{\otimes 2} | h_{2\alpha} \rangle$, and since η_g has no atoms we get:

$$\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \limsup_n p_{n,\alpha} = 0, \tag{10}$$

from which (ii) follows (in fact, in a much stronger form that allows K to be as large as $o(n^{1/4})$).

Now, by GHP convergence and [Mie09, Prop. 6] one can define on the same probability space $(\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^n, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2^n, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^n)$ and $(\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^\infty)$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^M$ is $o(1)$-close to $\mathbf{v}_i^M$ in total variation distance for each $i \in \{1,2,3\}$ and $M \in \{n, \infty\}$, and such that almost surely $|d_n(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^n, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j^n)/n^{1/4} -$

$d_\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j^\infty)| = o(1)$ for each i, j. Letting $q_\alpha := \mathbf{P}\{|d_\infty(\mathbf{v}_1^\infty, \mathbf{v}_3^\infty) - d_\infty(\mathbf{v}_2^\infty, \mathbf{v}_3^\infty)| \le \alpha\}$, it easily follows that

$$q_{\alpha/2} \le \limsup_n p_{n,\alpha}.$$

From (10) this implies that $\limsup_{\alpha\to 0} q_\alpha = 0$, which implies (i). □

2.4 Remaining proofs, II: Lemma 5

Before proving Lemma 5, we need to describe more precisely the objects Miermont's bijection leaves us with. We use the same notation as in the previous section for objects counted by $A_g(z)$ (marked faces F_1, F_2, minimum label in each face $0, \delta$, marked corners c_1, c_2). We will introduce the refinement

$$A_g(z) = \sum_{\epsilon\in\{-1,0,1\}} A_g^\epsilon(z)$$

where $A_g^\epsilon(z)$ counts the same objects as $A_g(z)$ but with the restriction that $\ell(c_2) - \ell(c_1) = \epsilon$. Unpacking the definitions in [Mie09] we have:

Lemma 8 (application of Miermont [Mie09, Thm. 4])**.** *For each $\epsilon \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, the labelled two-face maps counted by $[z^n]A_g^\epsilon(z)$ are in bijection with tuples (Q, s_1, s_2, e_1, e_2) such that:*
(M0) Q is a bipartite quadrangulation of genus g with n faces (unrooted);
(M1) s_1, s_2 are two vertices of Q and e_1, e_2 are two marked edges of Q;
(M2) for $j = 1..2$ let m_j be the endpoint of e_j closer from s_j, and let $\delta := d(s_1, m_1) + \epsilon - d(s_2, m_2)$. Then the quantity $d(s_1, s_2) + \delta$ is even.
(M3) Label each vertex v of the quadrangulation Q by $\ell(v) := \min(d(v, s_1), d(v, s_2) + \delta)$, and orient each edge towards its vertex of minimum label [2]. From an edge e, define the leftmost geodesic oriented path *as the oriented path starting from e and continuing after each edge with the first oriented edge encountered in counterclockwise order around its endpoint, stopped when it reaches s_1 or s_2. Then for $i = 1..2$, the leftmost geodesic oriented path starting at e_i ends at s_i.*

Note that, since Q is bipartite, the property $(M2)$ is equivalent to the following:
(M'2) $d(m_1, m_2) \equiv \epsilon \mod 2$.
As for the complicated property $(M3)$, up to subdominating cases, it can be rephrased in simpler terms closely related to nearest neighbours tessellations. Indeed, we have:

Lemma 9. *Let $b_g^\epsilon(n)$ be the number of tuples (Q, s_1, s_2, e_1, e_2) satisfying (M0), (M1), (M2) of the last lemma, and such that moreover we have:*
(M'3) $d(s_1, e_1) < d(s_1, e_2) - 4$ and $d(s_2, e_2) < d(s_2, e_1) - 4$.
Then for each $\epsilon \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ we have $[z^n]A_g^\epsilon(z) = b_g^\epsilon(n) + o(n^3 m_g(n))$.

Note that $(M'3)$ implies that $d(s_1, m_1) < d(s_1, m_2) - 2$ and $d(s_2, m_2) < d(s_2, m_1) - 2$.

Proof. Let (Q, s_1, s_2, e_1, e_2) satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 9. Then we claim that it also satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 8. Indeed define $\ell(v) = \min(d(s_1, v), d(s_2, v) + \delta)$ as in Lemma 8. We observe that (M'3) implies that

$$d(s_1, m_1) < d(s_1, m_1) + (d(s_2, m_1) - d(s_2, m_2) + \epsilon) = d(s_2, m_1) + \delta,$$

[2] As observed in [Mie09] under assumption (M2) the label varies by ± 1 along each edge so this is well defined.

which shows that the minimum in the definition of $\ell(v)$ for $v = m_1$ is reached only by its *first* argument. Similarly, for $v = m_2$ we have by (M'3) that:

$$d(s_2, m_2) < d(s_2, m_2) + (d(s_1, m_2) - d(s_1, m_1) - \epsilon) = d(s_1, m_2) - \delta,$$

which shows that the minimum in the definition of $\ell(v)$ for $v = m_2$ is reached only by its *second* argument. Thus the discussion in [Mie09, Sec 2.2] (more precisely the first inclusion sign $\subsetneq$ in the last displayed equation of that section) precisely says that (M3) is satisfied.

Conversely assume the hypotheses of Lemma 8. By general properties of Miermont's labelling (namely, the fact that leftmost oriented geodesic paths as defined in the lemma are, in particular, geodesic paths), property $(M3)$ ensures that the minima defining $\ell(m_1) = \min(d(m_1, s_1), d(m_1, s_2)+\delta)$ and $\ell(m_2) = \min(d(m_2, s_1), d(m_2, s_2)+\delta) = \min(d(m_2, s_1), d(m_1, s_1)+\epsilon)$ are reached respectively by their first and second argument (and possibly reached twice). This implies:

$$d(s_1, m_1) + \epsilon \leq d(s_1, m_2),\ \ d(s_2, m_2) \leq d(m_1, s_2) + \epsilon.$$

Thus, if hypothesis (M'3) is *not* satisfied, it must hold that either $|d(s_1, m_1) - d(s_1, m_2)| \leq 2$ or $|d(s_2, m_2) - d(s_2, m_1)| \leq 2$. It thus suffices to show that there are at most $o(n^3 m_g(n))$ tuples (Q, s_1, s_2, e_1, e_2) such that one of these two properties holds. For this it suffices to show that if $(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{e}_1) \in_u \mathcal{Q}_n^{(g)}$ is a random rooted quadrangulation and $(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{e}_2)$ are two vertices and an edge chosen independently uniformly at random in $\mathbf{q}$, the probability that $|d(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) - d(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)| \leq 2$ or $|d(\mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{e}_2) - d(\mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{e}_1)| \leq 2$ goes to zero as n goes to infinity. This directly follows from Lemmas 6 and 7(ii). □

In view of getting rid of the constraint $(M'2)$, we state the following lemma:

Lemma 10. *For any $\epsilon \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ we have as n goes to infinity:*

$$[z^n] A_g^\epsilon(z) \sim \frac{1}{3} [z^n] A_g(z).$$

Proof(sketch). This can be proved by asymptotic analysis of generating functions using a simple adaptation of the method developed in [CMS09] for the enumeration of labelled one-face maps by *scheme decomposition*: one can enumerate objects counted by $A_g^\epsilon(z)$ with this approach and realize that changing the parameter ϵ only affects the principal singularity by a factor $1 - O((1-12z)^{1/4})$, from which the result follows. We leave details to the reader. □

We are now ready to conclude the proof.

Proof of Lemma 5. First, we remark that from the last lemma:

$$[z^n]\big(A_g^0(z) + A_g^1(z)\big) \sim \frac{2}{3} [z^n] A_g(z), \tag{11}$$

while from Lemma 9 and the remark preceeding it, $[z^n]A_g^0(z) + A_g^1(z)$ is equivalent to the number of tuples (Q, s_1, s_2, e_1, e_2) satisfying properties $(M0), (M1)$, and $(M'3)$ (note that property $(M'2)$ disappears since we sum over both parities $\epsilon = 0, 1$). We will thus focus on such objects in the rest of the proof.

We note that a bipartite quadrangulation with a marked edge e_1 and a marked vertex v_1 can be canonically rooted by orienting e_1 towards its unique endpoint at even distance from v_1. This

gives a one-to-two correspondence between elements of $\mathcal{Q}_n^g$ with a marked vertex and (unrooted) bipartite quadrangulations of genus g with a marked vertex and a marked unoriented edge. We thus have:

$$\frac{[z^n]\big(A_g^0(z)+A_g^1(z)\big)}{(2n)\cdot n^2\cdot m_g(n)} \sim \frac{1}{2}\cdot \mathbf{P}\Big\{d(\mathbf{s}_1,\mathbf{e}_1)<d(\mathbf{s}_1,\mathbf{e}_2)-4,\ d(\mathbf{s}_2,\mathbf{e}_2)<d(\mathbf{s}_2,\mathbf{e}_1)-4\Big\}, \tag{12}$$

where the probability is taken over $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)} \in_u \mathcal{Q}_n^g$ with two uniform marked vertices $\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2$, a uniform marked edge $\mathbf{e}_2$ and $\mathbf{e}_1$ is the root edge (in the denominator, the factor n^2 corresponds to the choice of the two vertices, while the factor $(2n)$ corresponds to the choice of the edge $\mathbf{e}_2$).

We recall that we implicitly restrict ourselves to a subsequence along which the GHP distributional convergence

$$(\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}, \tfrac{1}{n^{1/4}}\mathbf{d}_n, \mu_n) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}, d_\infty, \mu_\infty)$$

holds. We will make use of this convergence using a coupling between $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}$ and $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$. More precisely, according to [Mie09, Proposition 6], we can build $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}$ and $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$ on the same probability space, and define a measure ν on $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)} \times \mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$ such that for each $k \geq 1$, if $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^i, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty^i)_{1\leq i\leq k} \sim \nu^{\otimes k}$ we have almost surely $|d_n(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^i, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^j)n^{-1/4} - d_\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty^i, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty^j)| \leq \epsilon_n$ for any i, j, and moreover the law of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^i$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty^i$) differs from μ_n (resp. μ_∞) by at most ϵ_n in total variation distance, where ϵ_n is a nonnegative real sequence going to zero when n goes to infinity. We will apply this with $k = 4$. Using Lemma 6, we can moreover assume the vertices $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3^n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_4^n$ are at distance at most 2 of two random edges $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1^n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2^n$ respectively, and that the law of $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1^n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2^n$ is ϵ_n-close in total variation to that of two uniform random edges (if necessary, we modify the sequence ϵ_n for this to be true, still asking that $\epsilon_n \to 0$).

If v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 are points (or subsets) in some metric space of underlying distance d, and $K \in \mathbb{R}$ let us define the events:

$$V_K(v_1,v_2,v_3,v_4) := \{d(v_1,v_3) < d(v_1,v_4) - K, d(v_2,v_4) < d(v_2,v_3) - K\}$$

$$W_K(v_1,v_2,v_3) := \{|d(v_1,v_3) - d(v_2,v_3)| \leq K\}.$$

By the assumptions made on the coupling between $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}$ and $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$ and from the triangle inequality we have, denoting Δ the symmetric difference:

$$V_4(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2^n, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1^n, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2^n) \Delta V_0^\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_4^\infty) \subset W_{\delta_n}^\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3^\infty) \cup W_{\delta_n}^\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_4^\infty)$$

with $\delta_n = O(\epsilon_n + n^{-1/4})$. We thus have:

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_n \big|\mathbf{P}V_4(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2^n, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1^n, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2^n) - \mathbf{P}V_0(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_4^\infty)\big| &\leq \limsup_n 2\mathbf{P}W_{\delta_n}^\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2^\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3^\infty) \\ &\leq \limsup_n \big(\epsilon_n + 2\mathbf{P}W_{\delta_n}^\infty(\mathbf{w}_1^\infty, \mathbf{w}_2^\infty, \mathbf{w}_3^\infty)\big)\end{aligned}$$

where $(\mathbf{w}_i^\infty)_{1\leq i\leq 3} \sim \mu_\infty^{\otimes 3}$ are three random vertices in $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$ chosen according to μ_∞, and where we just used the definition of total variation distance. From Lemma 7(i), the last lim sup is equal to zero, which implies:

$$\limsup_n \big|\mathbf{P}V_4(\mathbf{w}_1^n, \mathbf{w}_2^n, \mathbf{e}_1^n, \mathbf{e}_2^n) - \mathbf{P}V_0(\mathbf{w}_1^\infty, \mathbf{w}_2^\infty, \mathbf{w}_3^\infty, \mathbf{w}_4^\infty)\big| = 0$$

where $\mathbf{w}_1^n, \mathbf{w}_2^n, \mathbf{e}_1^n, \mathbf{e}_2^n$ are two vertices and two edges of $\mathbf{q}_n^{(g)}$ chosen independently uniformly at random, and where $(\mathbf{w}_i^\infty)_{1\leq i\leq 4} \sim \mu_\infty^{\otimes 4}$ are uniform in $\mathbf{q}_\infty^{(g)}$.

Now by rerooting invariance of random quadrangulations $\mathbf{P}V_4(\mathbf{w}_1^n, \mathbf{w}_2^n, \mathbf{e}_1^n, \mathbf{e}_2^n)$ is equal to the probability appearing in the R.H.S. of (12), while it follows directly from Lemma 7(i) and the Fubini theorem that the quantity $\mathbf{P}V_0(\mathbf{w}_1^\infty, \mathbf{w}_2^\infty, \mathbf{w}_3^\infty, \mathbf{w}_4^\infty)$ is equal to $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}_g(1-\mathbf{X}_g)$. This concludes the proof. □

To be fully complete we also state the:

Proof of Theorem 2. The only thing to prove is that $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}_g = \frac{1}{2}$, which is a direct consequence of Lemma 7. □

3 Three marked points (proof of Theorem 3)

In this section we sketch the proof of Theorem 3. We will insist on the combinatorial decompositions and the computation, since the details of the convergence results are very similar to what we did in the previous section.

We first need some definitions from [CMS09, Cha10]. If L is a one-face map, its *skeleton* is the map obtained by removing all vertices of degree 1 in L, and continuing to do so recursively until only vertices of degree at least 2 remain. Vertices of a one-face map that are vertices of degree at least 3 of its skeleton are called *nodes*. A node v that has degree k in the skeleton is called a k-node (note that its degree as a vertex in the one-face map can be larger than k). A one-face map is *dominant* if all vertices of its skeleton have degree at most 3, *i.e.* if all its nodes are 3-nodes. It is proved in [CMS09] that for fixed g, as n goes to infinity, a proportion at least $1 - O(n^{-1/4})$ of l.1.f.m. of genus g with n edges are dominant. By Euler's formula, a dominant one-face map has $4g-2$ nodes.

Following [Cha10], we introduce the operation of *opening*. If L is a one-face map and v is a 3-node of L, the *opening* of v is the operation that consists in replacing v by three new vertices, each linked to one edge of the skeleton, and distributing the three (possibly empty) subtrees attached to v among these new vertices as on the following figure:



Following [Cha10][3], we distinguish two types of 3-nodes in a one-face map: *intertwined nodes*, that are such that their opening results in a one-face map of genus $g-1$ with three marked vertices; and *non-intertwined nodes*, that are such that their opening results in a map of genus $g-2$ with three faces, and one marked vertex inside each face (here the map can be disconnected, and its genus and number of faces are defined additively on connected components). The *trisection lemma* [Cha10, Lemma 5], which is the key result underlying this section, asserts that any dominant map of genus $g \geq 1$ has exactly $2g$ intertwined nodes, hence $2g-2$ non-intertwined ones.

[3]Strictly speaking, these notions are defined only for dominant maps in that reference. Here it will be convenient for the presentation of the decompositions to extend them to general 3-nodes – but this is not a fundamental need, since in all quantities involved in our discussion will be led by dominant maps at the first order.



Figure 2: The three cases for a one-face map of genus $g+2$ rooted at skeleton edge leaving a non-intertwined 3-node v.

It follows that the number $K_{g+2}(n)$ of l.1.f.m. of genus $g+2$ with n edges whose root edge is a skeleton-edge leaving a *non-intertwined* 3-node satisfies:

$$K_{g+2}(n) \sim \frac{6(g+1)}{2n}[z^n]L_{g+2}(z). \tag{13}$$

Indeed, the first-order contribution is given by dominant l.1.f.m., and in a dominant l.1.f.m. of genus $g+2$ we can choose $3(2(g+2)-2) = 6(g+1)$ edges outgoing from a non-intertwined node as a new root edge, but we obtain each map $2n$ times in this way (since maps counted by $L_{g+2}(z)$ are already rooted at one of their $2n$ oriented edges).

We are now going to obtain another expression for the number $K_{g+2}(n)$ by performing a combinatorial decomposition. Comparing the two expressions will, in the end, lead us to Theorem 3.

Let L be a dominant l.1.f.m of genus $g+2$ whose root edge is a skeleton-edge leaving a non-intertwined 3-node v. We distinguish three cases, according to what happens when we perform the opening of the node v (see Figure 2):

(i) we disconnect the map into three components;
(ii) we disconnect the map into two components;
(iii) we do not disconnect the map.

We let $C^{(i)}_{g+2}(z)$, $C^{(ii)}_{g+2}(z)$, $C^{(iii)}_{g+2}(z)$ be the generating function for these three cases, respectively.

Configurations corresponding to (i) can be reconstructed by starting with three rooted l.1.f.m. of positive genera summing up to $g+2$, and joining the three root vertices by new edges to a new vertex v. The generating function for the contribution of this case is thus:

$$C^{(i)}_{g+2}(z) = (3zL_0(z))^3 \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2+g_3=g+2 \\ g_1,g_2,g_3>0}} L_{g_1}(z)L_{g_2}(z)L_{g_3}(z) \tag{14}$$

where for each new edge a factor $3zL_0(z)$ takes into account the increment of this edge, and the attachment of a rooted tree (possibly empty) in the newly created corner (see Figure 2–Left).

Configurations corresponding to (ii) can be reconstructed by joining with a new edge the root vertex of a l.1.f.m. to the root vertex of another one which is rooted at a *non-isthmic* edge of its skeleton (see Figure 2–Center). Now, arguing as in the previous section, for each $h \geq 1$, the

generating function $S_h(z)$ of l.1.f.m. of genus h rooted at a non-isthmic edge of their skeleton satisfies:

$$L_h(z) = S_h(z) + 3z \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2=h \\ g_1,g_2\geq 0}} L_{g_1}(z)L_{g_2}(z),$$

from which we get:

$$S_h(z) = (1-6zL_0(z))L_h - 3z \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2=h \\ g_1,g_2>0}} L_{g_1}(z)L_{g_2}(z).$$

It follows that the contribution for case (ii) is given by:

$$C^{(ii)}_{g+2} = 3\cdot(3zL_0(z)) \sum_{\substack{h+h'=g+2 \\ h,h'>0}} L_{h'}(z) \left((1-6zL_0(z))L_h - 3z \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2+g_3=h \\ g_1,g_2>0}} L_{g_1}(z)L_{g_2}(z) \right), \qquad (15)$$

where as before the factor $3zL_0(z)$ takes into account the increment of the newly created edge, and the (possibly empty) rooted tree to attach in the newly created corner, and where the global factor of 3 takes into account the choice of the root edge among the three skeleton-edges incident to the newly created vertex.

Summing up (14) and (15) we obtain the leading-order contribution for the sum of the first two cases:

$$C^{(i)}_{g+2}(z) + C^{(ii)}_{g+2}(z) \sim C\cdot(1-12z)^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{5}{2}(g+2)}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} C &= 2^{-5(g+2)} \sum_{g_1+g_2+g_3=g+2} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2}\tau_{g_3} + \frac{3\cdot 4}{2} 2^{-5(g+2)} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g+2} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2} - 3\cdot 2^{-5(g+2)} \sum_{g_1+g_2+g_3=g+2} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2}\tau_{g_3} \\ &= 2^{-5(g+2)} \left(6\cdot \sum_{g_1+g_2=g+2} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2} - 2\cdot \sum_{g_1+g_2+g_3=g+2} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2}\tau_{g_3} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $L_0(\frac{1}{12}) = 2$, and all sums are taken over positive indices (*i.e.* $g_1, g_2, g_3 > 0$).

Now, the leading-order contribution for the sum of three cases (i), (ii), (iii), which from (13) corresponds to the dominant singularity of the generating function $3(g+1)\int L_{g+2}(z)\frac{dz}{z}$ is given by (since all series are algebraic we can integrate expansions with no fear):

$$3(g+1)\frac{1}{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{5}{2}(g+2)} 2^{1-5(g+2)} \tau_{g+2} (1-12z)^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{5}{2}(g+2)}.$$

Taking the difference with the previous expression, we obtain that the leading order contribution corresponding to case (iii) is given by

$$C^{(iii)}_{g+2}(z) \sim C' 2^{-5(g+2)} (1-12)^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{5}{2}(g+2)} \qquad (16)$$

where:

$$C' = \frac{12(g+1)}{5g+7}\tau_{g+2} - \left(6\cdot \sum_{g_1+g_2=g+2} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2} - 2\cdot \sum_{g_1+g_2+g_3=g+2} \tau_{g_1}\tau_{g_2}\tau_{g_3} \right)$$

This expression can be considerably simplified. To this end, define the formal power series $U(s) = \sum_{g\geq 1} \tau_g s^g$. Then the t_g-recurrence is equivalent to the equation:

$$U(s) = \tfrac{s}{3} + \tfrac{1}{2}U(s)^2 + \frac{s}{3}(5(\tfrac{sd}{ds}) + 1)(5(\tfrac{sd}{ds}) - 1)U(s). \tag{17}$$

In view of the bi- and tri-linear sums appearing in the definition of C', we would like to find an equation involving the series $6U(s)^2 - 2U(s)^3$. Luckily, we have:

Lemma 11. *The following differential equation holds:*

$$\tfrac{4}{15}(5\tfrac{sd}{ds} - 3)_{((5))}\big(s^2U\big) = -(5(\tfrac{sd}{ds}) - 3)\big(6U^2 - 2U^3\big) + 12(\tfrac{sd}{ds} - 1)\big(U - \tfrac{s}{3}\big) - 28s^2 \tag{18}$$

where we use the notation $(5\frac{sd}{ds} - 3)_{((5))} = (5\frac{sd}{ds} - 3)(5\frac{sd}{ds} - 5)(5\frac{sd}{ds} - 7)(5\frac{sd}{ds} - 9)(5\frac{sd}{ds} - 11)$.

Extracting the coefficient of s^{g+2} in (18), we directly obtain that the constant C' can be rewritten in the much simpler form:

$$C' = \frac{4}{15}(5g + 5)(5g + 3)(5g + 1)(5g - 1)\tau_g.$$

To sum up the present discussion, we have determined the first order asymptotic of the generating function $C^{(iii)}_{g+2}(z)$ of rooted maps counted by case (iii). Applying standard transfer theorems, the corresponding coefficient $c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n) := [z^n]C^{(iii)}_{g+2}(z)$ satisfies:

$$c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n) \sim \frac{1}{15}2^{6-5(g+2)}/\Gamma(\tfrac{5}{2}g - \tfrac{1}{2})\tau_g \cdot n^{\frac{5}{2}(g+1)}12^n, \tag{19}$$

where we have used that $(5g + 5)(5g + 3)(5g + 1)(5g - 1)\Gamma(\frac{5}{2}g - \frac{1}{2}) = 2^4 \cdot \Gamma(\frac{5(g+2)}{2} - \frac{3}{2})$

It is now time to apply Miermont's bijection. If we disconnect the three endpoints belonging to the skeleton and the root vertex in a map from case (iii), we obtain a labelled map of genus g with three faces, with one marked vertex inside each face, subject to the constraint that those three vertices have the same label (see Figure 2-Right). Miermont's bijection transforms this object into a bipartite quadrangulation of genus g with *six* marked vertices $(s_1, s_2, s_3, v_1, v_2, v_3)$, such that for $i = 1..3$ the source v_i is closer from the vertex s_i than from the two other vertices s_j (to see this, write precisely the inequalities analogue to (6) as in the previous section). Arguing as in the previous section (see the sketch of proof below), up to subdominating cases, this property asymptotically characterizes those configurations, and we get:

Lemma 12. *The number $c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n)$ of configurations in case (iii) satisfies:*

$$\frac{c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n)}{n^5/4 \cdot 2^{-2}m_g(n)} \sim \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(1:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(2:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(3:3)}_g].$$

The reader can understand heuristically the denominator in the previous expression as follows. The factor $n^5/4$ comes from the fact that we have $\sim n^6$ ways to mark 6 vertices (among $n + 2 - 2g$) but that the quadrangulation is unrooted so we divide by $4n$. The factor 2^{-2} corresponds to the fact that we have two parity constraints relating the distances of the six points together (these constraints enable us to choose the delays in such a way that the target vertices get the same label while respecting the parity constraints on delays required by Miermont's bijection). We only sketch the proof of the lemma, since it is similar to what we did in the previous section.

Proof of Lemma 12(sketch). First, $A(n) := 2n \cdot c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n)$ counts *rooted* labelled three-face maps of genus g with n edges, with faces numbered F_1, F_2, F_3, with three marked vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 such that v_i is incident to the face F_i only, and such that $\ell(v_1) = \ell(v_2) = \ell(v_3)$. For $(\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3) \in \{0,1\}^2$, we introduce a variant $A^{\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}(n)$ of this number, counting the same objects but where the last property is replaced by $\ell(v_1) = \ell(v_2) - \epsilon_2 = \ell(v_3) - \epsilon_3$. For such an object we let δ_i be the minimum label in face F_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and we fix a translation class of labels by assuming that $\delta_1 = 0$. We also note $\epsilon_1 := 0$.

Let L be a three-face map counted by $A^{\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}(n)$ and Q be its associated quadrangulation by Miermont's bijection. Then Q is a bipartite quadrangulation of genus g with n faces, carrying three source vertices s_1, s_2, s_3 and the three marked vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, and is such that

$$\ell(v_i) = d(v_i, s_i) + \delta_i \leq d(v_i, s_j) + \delta_j, i \neq j. \tag{20}$$

Indeed this equation says that the minimum defining the label $\ell(v_i) := \min_{1\leq j\leq 3} d(v_i, s_j) + \delta_j$ in the Miermont labelling of the delayed quadrangulation Q is reached by its i-th argument, which corresponds to the fact that vertex v_i is incident to the face F_i in L. Writing that $\ell(v_i) - \epsilon_i = \ell(v_j) - \epsilon_j$ and applying (20), we find that :

$$d(v_i, s_i) - \epsilon_i \leq d(v_j, s_i) - \epsilon_j. \tag{21}$$

Since $|\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j| \leq 2$ we can say, loosely speaking, that up to an error at most 2, s_i is closer from v_i than from other v_j's in Q. Note that another constraint from Miermont's bijection is that, in Q, we have that $d(s_i, s_j) \equiv \delta_i + \delta_j \mod 2$ for all i, j, or equivalently, from (20), that $d(v_i, v_j) \equiv \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \mod 2$.

Conversely, let $B^{\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}(n)$ be the number of rooted bipartite quadrangulations of genus g with n faces and six marked vertices $s_1, s_2, s_3, v_1, v_2, v_3$ such that we have, for all $i \neq j$:

$$d(v_i, s_i) < d(v_j, s_i) - 2 \tag{22}$$

and such that $d(v_i, v_j) \equiv \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \mod 2$. Given such an object, defining for each vertex $\ell(v) = \min_{1\leq i\leq 3} d(s_i, v) + \delta_i$, where $\delta_i := d(v_i, s_i) - \epsilon_i + \epsilon_1 - d(v_1, s_1)$, we see from (22) that the minimum defining $\ell(v_i)$ is reached only by its i-th argument, and that $\ell(v_1) = \ell(v_2) - \epsilon_2 = \ell(v_3) - \epsilon_3$. This ensures that the three-face map associated to such a quadrangulation by the (reverse) Miermont bijection is one of the objects counted by $A^{\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}(n)$. In fact, the converse is true up to asymptotically negligible terms. Indeed, configurations counted by $A^{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}(n) - B^{\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}(n)$ correspond to cases where for at least one $i \neq j$, (21) holds but (22) does not: such configurations are few by Lemma 7(ii). Details are similar to the proof of Lemma 9 and we obtain that

$$B^{\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}(n) = 2A^{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}(n) + o(n^6 m_g(n)),$$

where the factor of 2 comes from the 2-to-1 nature of Miermont's bijection.

Now, similarly as in Lemma 10, it is easy to see that for different ϵ_1, ϵ_2 the numbers $A^{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}(n)$ have the same first order contribution and:

$$\sum_{(\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2)\in\{0,1\}^2} A^{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}(n) \sim 4 \cdot A^{0,0}(n).$$

Now $\sum_{(\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2)\in\{0,1\}^2} B^{\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}(n)$ counts rooted bipartite quadrangulations with marked vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, s_1, s_2, s_3 such that (22) holds, and in which no parity constraints remain. Recalling that $c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n) = \frac{1}{2n}A^{0,0}(n)$ we finally get

$$c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n) \sim \frac{1}{8\cdot 2n} n^6 m_g(n) \cdot \mathbf{P}\big\{\forall\, 1 \le i \ne j \le 3 :\ d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{s}_i) < d(\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{s}_i) - 2\big\}$$

where the probability is over $\mathbf{q}^{(g)}_n \in_u \mathcal{Q}^{(g)}_n$ and six uniform independent vertices $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3, \mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{s}_3)$ in $\mathbf{q}^{(g)}_n$. Finally, arguing exactly as in the proof of Lemma 5, the last probability converges to $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(1:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(2:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(3:3)}_g]$ and we are done. □

From the last lemma and the expansion of $m_g(n)$ it follows that

$$c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n) \sim 2^{-2-5g}/\Gamma(\tfrac{5}{2}g - \tfrac{1}{2})\tau_g \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(1:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(2:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(3:3)}_g] \cdot n^{5+\frac{5}{2}(g-1)} 12^n.$$

Comparing with the previously obtained expansion (19) of $c^{(iii)}_{g+2}(n)$ we find:

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(1:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(2:3)}_g \mathbf{Y}^{(3:3)}_g] \sim \frac{1}{15\cdot 2^2} = \frac{1}{60}$$

as claimed!

It only remains to prove Lemma 11:

Proof of Lemma 11. We give a simple proof based on linear algebra, relatively brutal and (therefore) easily computerized. Let E_0 denote Equation (17), and consider its derivatives $E_i := (\frac{d}{ds})^i E_0$ for $i \in [1..3]$. We thus obtain a polynomial system of four equations $\{E_i, i \in [0..3]\}$, involving the quantities $U_i = (\frac{d}{ds})^i U(s)$ for $i = 0..5$. This system is *linear* and *triangular* in U_2, U_3, U_4, U_5 (note that it is *not* linear in U_0 and U_1). We can then solve for these four quantities and we obtain an expression of each U_i for $i \in [2..5]$ as a (nonlinear) polynomial of $U_0 = U(s)$ and $U_1 = \frac{d}{ds}U(s)$ (with coefficients that are Laurent polynomials of s). Now expand the quantity $(5\frac{sd}{ds} - 3)_{((5))}\big(s^2 U\big)$ as a linear combination of the U_i's, and substitute the expressions just obtained of U_i for $i = 2..5$ in it. We obtain an equation of the form:

$$(5\tfrac{sd}{ds} - 3)_{((5))}\big(s^2 U\big) = \text{Polynomial}(s, s^{-1}, U(s), \tfrac{d}{ds}U(s))$$

which, computations made, is (18). □

Acknowledgements

I thank Jean-François Marckert and Grégory Miermont for interesting discussions related to the content of this note.

References

[BC86] Edward A. Bender and E. Rodney Canfield. The asymptotic number of rooted maps on a surface. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 43(2):244–257, 1986.

[BGR08] Edward A. Bender, Zhicheng Gao, and L. Bruce Richmond. The map asymptotics constant t_g. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 15(1):Research paper 51, 8, 2008.

[BM] Jérémy Bettinelli and Grégory Miermont. in preparation.

[BMJ06] Mireille Bousquet-Mélou and Svante Janson. The density of the ISE and local limit laws for embedded trees. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(3):1597–1632, 2006.

[CC15] Sean R. Carrell and Guillaume Chapuy. Simple recurrence formulas to count maps on orientable surfaces. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 133:58–75, 2015.

[Cha10] Guillaume Chapuy. The structure of unicellular maps, and a connection between maps of positive genus and planar labelled trees. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 147(3-4):415–447, 2010.

[CMS09] Guillaume Chapuy, Michel Marcus, and Gilles Schaeffer. A bijection for rooted maps on orientable surfaces. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 23(3):1587–1611, 2009.

[CS04] Philippe Chassaing and Gilles Schaeffer. Random planar lattices and integrated super-Brownian excursion. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 128(2):161–212, 2004.

[CV81] Robert Cori and Bernard Vauquelin. Planar maps are well labeled trees. *Canad. J. Math.*, 33(5):1023–1042, 1981.

[FS09] P. Flajolet and R. Sedgewick. *Analytic combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.

[GJ08] I. P. Goulden and D. M. Jackson. The KP hierarchy, branched covers, and triangulations. *Adv. Math.*, 219(3):932–951, 2008.

[KKN99] Vladimir A. Kazakov, Ivan K. Kostov, and Nikita Nekrasov. D-particles, matrix integrals and KP hierarchy. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 557(3):413–442, 1999.

[LG13] Jean-François Le Gall. Uniqueness and universality of the Brownian map. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(4):2880–2960, 2013.

[LGM12] Jean-François Le Gall and Grégory Miermont. Scaling limits of random trees and planar maps. In *Probability and statistical physics in two and more dimensions*, volume 15 of *Clay Math. Proc.*, pages 155–211. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.

[LZ04] Sergei K. Lando and Alexander K. Zvonkin. *Graphs on surfaces and their applications*, volume 141 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. With an appendix by Don B. Zagier, Low-Dimensional Topology, II.

[Mie09] Grégory Miermont. Tessellations of random maps of arbitrary genus. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 42(5):725–781, 2009.

[Mie13] Grégory Miermont. The Brownian map is the scaling limit of uniform random plane quadrangulations. *Acta Math.*, 210(2):319–401, 2013.

[MS01] Michel Marcus and Gilles Schaeffer. Une bijection simple pour les cartes orientables. *manuscript*, 2001.

[MS15] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and the Brownian map I: The QLE(8/3,0) metric. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2015.

[Sch98] G. Schaeffer. *Conjugaison d'arbres et cartes combinatoires aléatoires*. PhD thesis, Université Bordeaux I, 1998.

[Tut63] W. T. Tutte. A census of planar maps. *Canad. J. Math.*, 15:249–271, 1963.